

**U.S. Department of Education**  
**2011 - Blue Ribbon Schools Program**  
**A Public School**

School Type (Public Schools): ☐ Charter ☒ Title 1 ☐ Magnet ☐ Choice  
(Check all that apply, if any)

Name of Principal: Ms. Marilyn Feeney

Official School Name: Park School

School Mailing Address: 40 Asylum Road  
Warwick, RI 02886-8099

County: Kent

State School Code Number: 35132

Telephone: (401) 734-3690 E-mail: feeneym@warwickschools.org

Fax: (401) 734-3693 Web URL: www.warwickschools.org

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Principal's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Superintendent\*: Dr. Peter Horoschak Ed.D. Superintendent e-mail:  
horoschak@warwickschools.org

District Name: Warwick Public Schools District Phone: (401) 734-3000

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Superintendent's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Mrs. Bethany Furtado

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

*\*Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

The original signed cover sheet only should be converted to a PDF file and emailed to Aba Kumi, Blue Ribbon Schools Project Manager (aba.kumi@ed.gov) or mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173.

## PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

---

11R12

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.
3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2010-2011 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2005.
6. The nominated school has not received the Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years: 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 or 2010.
7. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
8. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
9. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
10. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

## PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

11R12

All data are the most recent year available.

### DISTRICT

1. Number of schools in the district: 17 Elementary schools  
(per district designation) 3 Middle/Junior high schools  
3 High schools  
0 K-12 schools  
23 Total schools in district
2. District per-pupil expenditure: 15336

### SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located: Suburban with characteristics typical of an urban area
4. Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school: 2
5. Number of students as of October 1, 2010 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total			# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	0	0	0		6	20	13	33
K	17	11	28		7	0	0	0
1	25	28	53		8	0	0	0
2	19	17	36		9	0	0	0
3	21	15	36		10	0	0	0
4	27	15	42		11	0	0	0
5	21	9	30		12	0	0	0
Total in Applying School:								258

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: 0 % American Indian or Alaska Native  
14 % Asian  
3 % Black or African American  
14 % Hispanic or Latino  
0 % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander  
69 % White  
0 % Two or more races  
100 % Total

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the 2009-2010 school year: 15%

This rate is calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

(1)	Number of students who transferred <b>to</b> the school after October 1, 2009 until the end of the school year.	21
(2)	Number of students who transferred <b>from</b> the school after October 1, 2009 until the end of the school year.	18
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	39
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1, 2009	258
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.15
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	15

8. Percent limited English proficient students in the school: 25%

Total number of limited English proficient students in the school: 65

Number of languages represented, not including English: 17

Specify languages:

Arabic, Cantonese, Cebuano, Chinese, Gujarati, Hmong, Japanese, Khmer, Korean, Laotian, Mandarin, Portuguese, Russian, Spanish, Tagalog, Tamil, Vietnamese

9. Percent of students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals:

36%

Total number of students who qualify:

93

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-priced school meals program, supply an accurate estimate and explain how the school calculated this estimate.

Our disadvantaged population is at 74% because the State of Rhode Island includes ELL, IEP, and FRL students in determining disadvantaged backgrounds.

10. Percent of students receiving special education services:

13%

Total number of students served:

33

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

<u>3</u> Autism	<u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>6</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>7</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>1</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>13</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>1</u> Mental Retardation	<u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>2</u> Developmentally Delayed

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff	
	<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>13</u>	<u>0</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>17</u>	<u>1</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>
Support staff	<u>9</u>	<u>0</u>
Total number	<u>44</u>	<u>1</u>

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1:

20:1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only high schools need to supply graduation rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any student or teacher attendance rates under 95% and teacher turnover rates over 12% and fluctuations in graduation rates.

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Daily student attendance	96%	95%	95%	96%	96%
Daily teacher attendance	97%	95%	94%	93%	95%
Teacher turnover rate	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
High school graduation rate	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

If these data are not available, explain and provide reasonable estimates.

Teacher Attendance Rates under 95%:

- 2006-2007 - One teacher out on extended FMLA leave.
- 2007-2008 - Two teachers out on extended FMLA leave.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools): Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2010 are doing as of Fall 2010.

Graduating class size: \_\_\_\_\_

Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	_____ %
Enrolled in a community college	_____ %
Enrolled in vocational training	_____ %
Found employment	_____ %
Military service	_____ %
Other	_____ %
<b>Total</b>	<b>_____ 0%</b>

Park School has many strengths and successes that deem it worthy of Blue Ribbon recognition. The mission of Park School is to develop a comprehensive educational and nurturing environment that prepares all students to become self-directed, life-long learners, skilled communicators and complex thinkers who are respectful, responsible and cooperative members within the school community. Because character counts, the entire student body is currently focused on "The Journey to Success" as we nurture character development throughout each step of the pyramid focusing on HARD WORK, FRIENDSHIP, LOYALTY, COOPERATION, ENTHUSIASM, SELF-CONTROL, ALERTNESS, ACTION, DETERMINATION, FITNESS, SKILL, TEAM SPIRIT, POISE, CONFIDENCE, AND OUR PERSONAL BEST. The faculty and staff of Park School recognize that learning is a life-long process. In addition to character development, our educators are focused on combining the teaching of fundamentals and higher level thinking, problem solving, and communication skills so that our students will have a strong foundation on which to build their futures. The implementation of Think Five Problem Solving, school-wide, is just one of the ways that our school has exemplified its vision. Math binders that follow the students, along with their portfolios, are another way that we foster the importance of organizational skills. Currently, Park School provides a Title I after school Extended Learning Program for students in grades 3-5 who might benefit from additional reading resources. Affording each individual student the opportunity to achieve his/her potential is our mission!

True to tradition, a democratic education is cultivated at Park School. The students in grades four through six elect representatives each year to work with the faculty and staff to provide leadership for the student body in the form of a Student Council. A sense of community is embraced as Park School students have, through various student directed activities, raised funds to provide holiday gifts and food for needy families in the Park School community. The student body, led by the Student Council, has been involved in caring for fellow students around the world. Students raised funds and collected books for a school library in Louisiana. Blankets for orphans, as well as school supplies for the students of Haiti, have been collected on numerous occasions. Park students have sent letters of support and supplies to our soldiers overseas. For years, students who have attended this unique neighborhood school, along with a dedicated and tenured staff, have held the traditions of Park School in high regard. Annually, students participate in Art Night, Science Night, Egg Drop, Reading Week, the 100th Day Celebration, and Field Day. The students also experience bowling and ice skating, as well as field trips to local farms. In addition, many cultural and family events are sponsored by the PTO. Providing our diverse population the opportunity to experience the rich traditions of Warwick builds valuable life experiences for our students.

Park School has reached several important milestones to date, professional development being the most prevalent. For example, to enhance the Common Core training in the English Language Arts and Math curriculums, as well as Sheltered Instruction in Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model, took place. The SIOP Model, for teachers, involves the lesson planning and delivery system. SIOP recognizes that language acquisition is enhanced through meaningful use and interaction. The SIOP protocol is the instrument used to observe, rate, and provide feedback on lessons. Various teams of teachers and administrators are currently undergoing training in new assessment programs which will enable teachers to further drive instruction. Furthermore, the School Improvement Team (SIT) has long been in existence to provide for the needs of Park School students. Certainly, the recent 50th anniversary of Park School was a noteworthy milestone, celebrated with a reunion dinner, attended by over 100 alumni. In addition, an Open House was held where alumni were treated to a nostalgic review of Park School through the years. Alumni were reminded that when people rise above expectations and seize opportunities, milestones truly can be reached.

Park Elementary School is one of seventeen neighborhood schools serving elementary students in Warwick, Rhode Island. Upon entering Park School, one can't help but notice the sense of community that is cultivated here. None of us stands alone. What truly sets Park apart from the others, though, is its diversity. Park, a Title I school, is home to the elementary English Language Learners (ELL), from around the district, whose diversity is embraced and cause for celebration. The benefits are felt school-

wide by both the neighborhood and ELL students, and it is the cultural diversity in our classrooms that opens the minds of all students to enriching real-world experiences. Most impressive, however, is the dedication and commitment of the faculty and staff to all the students and families of Park School. It is heartfelt and true, "It takes a village."



### 1. Assessment Results:

Remarkably, recent performance trends evidenced in Park School's English language arts scores, indicate some significant gains. Most excitedly, though, is the fact that growth was realized in both the overall student population, as well as the subgroup identified as SES, or economically disadvantaged. For example, in examining the school year 2007-2008, we ascertain 70% of grade 3 students achieved proficiency in reading, while 58% of the grade 3 SES subgroup scored proficient. By the 2009-2010 school year, this group of now grade 5 students had improved overall to 88% proficient, and the SES subgroup improved to 82% proficient. In examining the entire school population we determined 69% were proficient in reading in 2007-2008. By 2009-2010 the overall proficiency level had increased to 82%, another indication of positive performance trends.

In regard to the trends found in Park School's math scores for the academic school years 2007-2008 through 2009-2010, they also support a substantial growth rate for the overall population; an increase from 53% to 72%. Upon analysis, we discovered grade 3 students scores improved from 46% in 2007 to the 81% realized in grade 5 in 2009. At the same time, the SES grade 3 scores improved from 38% in 2007 to 72% in grade 5 2009.

While test scores can fluctuate from year to year, a significant achievement gap was recognized in the 2009-2010 scores as the gains for the subgroup SES were less favorable than those of their peers. The grade 3 SES subgroup reading score of 54% proficient in reading, when compared to the overall grade 3 student score of 88%, fell far short. Similarly, the grade 3 SES subgroup math score of 29% proficient was far below the overall grade 3 student score of 81%. To address these gaps, many interventions have been put in place. Initially, grade level classroom teachers meet as teams to analyze and interpret test results. Said teams note individual students' strengths, as well as weaknesses. This data is further used to drive instruction. Subsequently, in support of students' needs, Park School offers an after-school Title I Extended Learning Program for students in grades 3 through 5 whose New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) scores were less than proficient in either math and/or English language arts. Students are instructed in specific strategies for math problem solving, as well as a reinforcement of reading comprehension strategies. Most recently, though, Response to Intervention (RtI) teams have been implemented to ensure immediate interventions are in place in the classroom to enhance overall student performance while addressing obvious achievement gaps.

The quest for "meeting the standard" is one all elementary students in grades three through six must face each fall. In Rhode Island, all students, other than those who were born outside of and educated for less than twelve months in the United States, are given the NECAP math and English language arts assessment. Test results can vary from **Substantially Below Proficient** (Level 1), **Partially Proficient** (Level 2), **Proficient** (Level 3), to **Proficient with Distinction** (Level 4).

Without a doubt, we expect our students to receive a minimal score of Level 3, which demonstrates proficiency in the content and skills which students have learned through the end of the previous grade. To achieve a score of Proficient (Level 3) in the English language arts assessment, a students' performance must demonstrate an ability to read and comprehend grade-appropriate text. Students must be able to analyze and interpret literary and informational text. Students must make and support relevant assertions by referencing the text. Students must also use vocabulary strategies and breadth of vocabulary knowledge to read and comprehend the text. Further, to receive a score of Proficient with Distinction (Level 4), the students' performance must meet all the aforementioned criteria, in addition to, offering insightful observations/assertions that are well supported by references to the text. Subsequently, the students use a range of vocabulary strategies and breadth of vocabulary knowledge to read and comprehend a wide variety of texts.

In terms of math scores, to achieve Proficiency (Level 3), a student's problem solving must demonstrate logical reasoning with appropriate explanations that include both words and proper mathematical notation. The student must use a variety of strategies that are often systematic. Computational errors cannot interfere with communication understanding. The student must demonstrate conceptual understanding of most aspects of the grade level expectations. To achieve Proficient with Distinction (Level 4), the student's work must meet the above criteria, as well as exhibit a high level of accuracy, effective use of a variety of strategies, and an understanding of mathematical concepts within and across grade level expectations. The student must demonstrate the ability to move from concrete to abstract representations.

Information on RI's NECAP results can be found at [www.ride.gov/assessment](http://www.ride.gov/assessment)

## **2. Using Assessment Results:**

When test results become available, Park School teachers, led by the principal, participate in a self-study. The first step in self-study entails item analysis. This is the identification of the most frequently correct items and most frequently missed items. The belief is that the Grade Level Expectations (GLEs), associated with the most frequently correct items are considered areas of strength and the GLEs associated with the most frequently missed items must now become our focus for improving student learning and changing instruction.

The next step incorporates data analysis. Here we analyze the GLE stems associated with areas of greatest need, summarizing specific big ideas and indicators that students need to practice to become proficient.

The third step in our self-study is to develop findings. As a team we define what changes are needed in student learning, and further illustrate what students need in order to become more proficient.

The final step is one of communicating findings. Results are presented to Park School's Improvement Team (SIT) for review. The SIT then aligns the findings to identify common areas of need. These common areas then determine school-wide conclusions and further define the next steps for professional development. Recent findings identified a need for a math coach to reinforce problem solving techniques. This need has since been addressed.

Additionally, through the most recent analysis of the 2009 grade 3 NECAP results in math, primary teachers came to several conclusions. A need for more work in problem solving with an emphasis on math vocabulary and connections, as well as incorporating math vocabulary words to classroom word walls, was understood. The necessity to model Think Five Problem Solving through the gradual release model so that students would eventually become responsible for independent problem solving was also evident.

What's more, through the analysis of the grade 4 reading results from the 2009 NECAP; teachers came to several other important conclusions. It was decided that teachers would designate more time to working with words to address the students' deficit in the area of phonemic awareness. In addition, they would revisit the RAISE format for constructed responses, and include a constructed response rubric in their reading and social studies notebooks. More instruction would be provided in monitoring comprehension, in all content areas, including Social Studies and Science, by utilizing The Comprehension Toolkit by Stephanie Harvey and Anne Goudvis.

## **3. Communicating Assessment Results:**

Annually, Park School receives the results from the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) mid-year. When scores are finally released publicly, in late January, the State Commissioner of Education reports individual district and school scores in the local newspaper. While achievement level

results are used in the state accountability system, more detailed school and district results are used to help improve our curriculum and instruction. Parents receive individual student results, as well, outlining their child's performance on grade level expectations.

At Park, School Report Night takes place in the fall of each school year. This is an opportunity for parents to understand how learning, at all grade levels, contributes to school wide achievement. The night commences with parents being made aware of the standardized testing protocol utilized at Park, understanding why their child is assessed annually, and the invaluable data garnered from these assessments. Discussions are led regarding test design, and an overview of each content area takes place. Further, parents learn that Park School educators review these results to evaluate how well the students are achieving the learning targets contained in the Common Core Standards. Parents are also given the opportunity to review, and compare/contrast, the results from previous years in an effort to highlight the percentage of students who scored at or above proficiency. The night culminates with parents developing an action plan.

For the 2010-2011 school year, the action plan includes:

- Complete an item analysis of the NECAP science results
- Complete an item analysis of NECAP results in reading, math, and writing
- Math Coach (professional development) to model problem solving
- Review of student work in an effort to improve the core curriculum
- Collaboration with The Dana Center to develop a guaranteed, viable curriculum in math
- Complete a Gap Analysis of the subgroups, SES, special education, and English language learners, to ensure all students achieve proficiency by 2014.

School Report Night concludes with parents participating in a "*You Be The Scorer*" activity. The parents work in groups reviewing student responses at different grade levels and content areas. The parents review the student's response, assign a score, write a short justification for their score, and compare their score with the actual assigned score. The various groups share their findings. A rich source of information, all agree, much is gained at Park School's Report Night!

#### **4. Sharing Lessons Learned:**

The Warwick School District consists of seventeen elementary schools, one of which is home to the English as a Second Language (ESL) elementary program. Park School is the designated ESL elementary school in Warwick, with the current principal serving in her second year. Before coming to Park her knowledge of the ESL program and specifically, English Language Learners, was limited.

Upon registration, as required by the Rhode Island Department of Education, all parents complete a Home Language Survey. When deemed necessary, students whose first language is other than English, are screened for English language proficiency. If a student qualifies for ESL, a parent has two choices; transfer the child to Park so that they can participate in the ESL program, or have the child remain at the home school without direct ESL support services. The latter often creates a challenge for the home school classroom teacher, as well as the identified ELL student. The current principal is now in a position to address these challenges.

Consequently, the ESL staff will conduct Professional Development for the remaining 16 elementary schools, focusing on the schools where identified ELL students remain. This training will include:

- Providing fellow educators with the expertise in classroom instruction that incorporates both academic language and content to ELLs, thus increasing their chances for success in the mainstream.

- Affording classroom teachers the ability to understand that sheltered instruction is not simply a set of additional or replacement instructional techniques that teachers may then implement in their classrooms. Rather, it draws from, and complements, methods advocated for both second language and mainstream classrooms.

Additionally, a folder will be created on the Warwick Public School's email/communication bulletin board entitled: English Language Learners-Instructional Strategies that Work. Monthly, Park's staff will post various research-based approaches and material that have proven successful. This professional exchange will provide an open line of communication between the ESL staff and teachers at Warwick's other elementary schools that does not currently exist.

As educational leader of Park School and its ESL program, the Principal will also strive to establish an after school program at several of the other elementary schools in the district. The program will be designed to meet the needs of ELLs by providing the students with an opportunity to enrich their English language skills in the four domains: Speaking, Listening, Reading, and Writing.

## 1. Curriculum:

Park School adheres to the core curriculum guides created by the Warwick Public Schools' Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Development. Warwick's curriculum areas are aligned with the Grade Level Expectations (GLEs) and the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP). The intent of these curriculum guides is not only to increase the effectiveness of teaching the GLEs, but also to provide an instructional framework for equitable teaching and learning at Park School. These curriculum guides support the gradual release of responsibility model.

Each curriculum guide utilized by Park teachers is based on Webb's Depth of Knowledge for level of questioning. This mechanism is in place to ensure that the intent of each standard, and the level of student demonstration required by that standard, is in direct correlation with the assessment item. This mechanism also makes sure teachers are instructing at a level that will promote maximum student achievement.

The English Language Arts Curriculum Guides weave the district's instructional reading and writing frameworks together. The foundation for early reading strategies is laid in the primary grades and built upon in each grade after. Students learn to differentiate among a variety of genres. Students learn to utilize phonemic awareness, and to apply phonological knowledge skills to the written word; allowing them to become proficient by applying structural analysis skills to their reading. Reading fluency and accuracy skills, along with word identification and decoding strategies are fostered. Vocabulary skills are enhanced during read-alouds, as teachers instruct students to unlock the meaning of unfamiliar words. Students learn how to generate personal responses by making text to self, text to text, and text to world connections. Through analysis and interpretation of information and literary texts, students become adept at citing evidence to support their conclusions. Daily, Park School students participate in a literate community where individuals' needs are met by providing rigorous instruction.

Furthermore, the writing curriculum is initiated early on, as teachers established a purpose for writing. Children brainstorm to generate ideas, draw pictures, and Kid-Write. As they advance, students utilize prewriting, drafting, revising, and critiquing skills to produce final drafts. The structure of the English language is address through daily word work and grammar skills. While utilizing a variety of genres, and incorporating written responses to literature, students are afforded numerous opportunities to demonstrate their mastery of the written language.

The Math\* Curriculum Guide allows students to construct personal knowledge derived from meaningful experiences to help them make sense of mathematics. Students begin their investigation of math by constructing and demonstrating number meaning. They apply knowledge of basic math facts and arithmetic operations to real-life situations. They explore and identify fractions, place value, reading, writing, and comparing numbers. They add, subtract, multiply, and divide single and multi-digit whole numbers, fraction, decimals, and percentages. They investigate money and estimation. Students learn to identify, describe, extend, and create patterns of color, size, shape, and quantity in Algebra. Students construct and classify geometric shapes. They also interpret data on charts, graphs, line plots, and tables. All students utilize the Think Five strategy for problem solving. Park School classrooms foster a community of learners where students and teachers are actively involved in *doing* mathematics.

*\*Currently, Park School is involved with the Dana Center, from the University of Texas, to develop a guaranteed and viable Math Curriculum.*

The Visual Arts Curriculum at Park School is focused on the areas of creating art and responding to art to prepare for graduation by proficiency through creative problem solving, exploration with media, tools,

and techniques, creation of art utilizing art elements, and discovering the expressionistic and communicative quality of art.

The Health Curriculum at Park School provides all students with the skills and knowledge necessary to promote responsible lifetime decision making that will contribute to a healthy and safe society. Students are encouraged to assess their attitudes and behavior patterns and to understand the impact their life choices have on their communities and on their own well-being.

Park's Nutrition Education Program is focused on helping all children and their families, learn and practice better eating habits, combat obesity, and attain lifelong good health.

The Physical Education Curriculum at Park is focused on providing opportunities for students to gain the necessary skills and knowledge for lifelong participation in physical activity through movement, personal fitness, and personal and social responsibility.

Without a doubt, teachers at Park School are well versed in differentiated instruction, and embrace the belief that this teaching approach provides a variety of learning options adaptable to the differences in how students learn. Daily, teachers incorporate multimodal activities into their lessons to accommodate a wide array of students' needs. Teachers afford students opportunities to select activities that capitalize on personal interests, thus enticing students into learning and studying a given topic. Whenever possible, Park School teachers provide opportunities that promote interdependence, address individual and group accountability, and encourage interpersonal and small group skills. It is this environment, at Park School, that promotes student learning and academic achievement, discourages student retention, enhances student satisfaction with their learning experience, and help students develop oral communication skills and social skills, while promoting student self-esteem.

## **2. Reading/English:**

Reading and writing are taught through the Balanced Literacy Framework at Park School. The program is based on the research of Marie Clay, Irene Fountas, and Gay Sue Pennell and is grounded in the belief that all students can learn to read and write; a philosophy we embrace. As a result, the classrooms at Park School are designed around the Literacy Collaborative Model where educating children occurs in a child-centered classroom, providing numerous opportunities for real life reading and writing experiences.

The goal of Park's Literacy Collaborative Model is to ensure all children become readers and writers who enjoy and value literacy. Our classrooms provide all students with essential opportunities for acquiring the necessary foundational reading skills. Daily, students participate in self-selected reading, conferencing with teachers, writing workshop, and teacher directed reading in content areas such as Social Studies, and Health. Small guided reading groups transpire with focused word work. Additionally, parent involvement is encouraged through a home reading component.

Guided reading is implemented across all grade levels, with literature circles in place at the intermediate level. During guided reading, teachers work with small groups of children who have similar reading processes and needs. The teacher selects and introduces literature carefully chosen from our literacy closet to correlate with the instructional level of students. Each group fosters comprehension skills and strategies, develops background knowledge, oral language skills, and provides the necessary instructional level reading.

Comprehension is supplemented with The Comprehension Toolkit by Stephanie Harvey and Ann Goudvis. The premise of this program is that reading comprehension is the evolution of thought that occurs as students read. Teachers model strategies that encourage students to construct meaning as they read. The toolkit emphasizes responsive teaching. Therefore, teachers continuously observe and document students' learning through assessment data, providing additional support when needed.

In response to student need, differentiated instruction is implemented. Additionally, students in need receive a Personal Literacy Plan (PLP) and tiered interventions through the RtI process. Struggling readers in grades K-3 participate in additional literacy groups taught by our reading specialist. Our reading specialist is also a qualified Reading Recovery instructor benefiting many pre-readers in need of assistance. Park School offers an after-school extended learning program. Students have the opportunity to attend three separate eight-week sessions, focused on enrichment skills in reading comprehension. Park School teachers' diligence encourages success for all.

### **3. Mathematics:**

At Park School, the four content strands are taught: Numbers and Operations, Functions and Algebra, Geometry and Measurement, Data Statistics and Probability, utilizing the following instructional resources.

**Scott Foresman Text Book:** Teachers initiate their instruction of new mathematical concepts with this text book. This resource highlights children using mathematics in real-life activities, generating interest and illustrating relevance.

**Investigations:** This resource further enables students to make sense of mathematical concepts, thus encouraging them to become mathematical thinkers. This curriculum addresses the diverse needs of students in a wide range of classroom and communities. Investigations is carefully designed to provide mathematic skills to all students; boys and girls, members of diverse cultural, ethnic, and language groups, all of whom possess a wide variety of strengths, needs, and interests.

**Calendar Math:** This program provides 10-15 minutes of daily supplementary math instruction. Students and teachers use current data from the various elements on their bulletin boards to explore new angles in mathematical relationships. In discussing the data each day, students at every level are afforded the opportunity to analyze data, perceive patterns, explore mathematical relationships, and communicate their thinking.

**Morning Math:** Teachers in the intermediate grades utilize daily math practice that emphasizes frequent, focused practice leading to mastery and retention of math skills.

**Mountain Math:** Third grade teachers use this method to aid in review and retention of previously taught concepts. This tool is used as a whole-class activity, individual activity, with partners or in cooperative learning groups, depending on the needs of the students.

In an effort to improve students' math skills, Park teachers participated in several professional development sessions. Workshops focus on using rubrics and benchmark papers to assess student performance in achieving standards. Teachers quickly embraced the Think Five problem solving strategy and Exemplar rubric. Math vocabulary word walls and math notebooks were instituted as well. Furthermore, students struggling in math are afforded the following. A struggling student is referred to an RtI team, where collected data is reviewed. Strategies and interventions are examined, implemented, and later reevaluated. Students are encouraged to participate in Park's after school Extended Learning Program where food and nutrition are integrated with reading, writing, and math activities.

### **4. Additional Curriculum Area:**

The teachers at Park School reinforce our mission "to prepare all students to become self-directed, life-long learners, and complex thinkers who are respectful, responsible, and cooperative members of their school" throughout the Social Studies curriculum.

Kindergarten students are introduced to **Our World, Now and Long Ago**. Students explore what people need in order to live. They consider where these products come from now and where they came from in

the past. They discover how groups of people cooperate to provide goods and services to others in their community and country.

In first grade, students recognize that large groups of people working together requires a framework so that there is order and equity. They come to understand how this has evolved into the establishment of rules and laws. Students discover how groups of people acquire beliefs, values, institutions, behaviors, and traditions that are successful.

Second grade students continue to explore and evaluate the world around them. They realize that government helps people live together in a safe and orderly manner. Students learn how people use resources and modify their environment as more and more communities are established.

Third grade students begin to recognize how people in communities are dependent upon one another and how interconnected the communities around the world are. They realize how certain communities gravitate toward forming political, economic, and social organizations to help manage daily affairs.

In the fourth grade, students study geography and the ways in which people use it. They study how the population of the United States has evolved over time. Regions of the U.S., its history, economy, and culture, are also explored.

Fifth grade students are introduced to the basic freedoms and rights afforded all citizens. They study the American Revolution, its position on democracy, freedom, and the important historical documents that articulate them. Students follow a growing nation through the Civil War and Reconstruction.

During the sixth grade, students examine human beings; how they create, learn, and adapt to culture. They examine beliefs, values, institutions, behaviors, traditions, and ways of life for various groups of people. Students explore the spread of civilization, as well as the rise of late civilization, continuing on to early modern world and present day.

Undoubtedly, the common threads illustrated in this curriculum emphasize the importance of collaboration, decision making, and problem solving in sustaining a democratic society.

## **5. Instructional Methods:**

Park is a Title I, inclusion school. At Park, we subscribe to the belief that through an inclusive education model all children, especially those with disabilities, they will have embarked upon a path that leads to an adult life as an integral, participating member of society. We firmly believe that by meeting all students' needs in the mainstream, we have increased their ability to achieve both academic and emotional growth, thus affording all students the opportunity to realize their individual potential. Inclusive education enhances the students' overall quality of life as it teaches all children the value of team work and how the necessity to interrelate and function cohesively with others of different abilities is a valuable life-skill. Meeting the needs of all children, however, requires careful planning and preparation. The teachers at Park School continually collaborates; striving to create learning strategies and environments that are meaningful for all students. The following lists a variety of instructional strategies currently employed to ensure maximum student learning and achievement.

- **Reading Recovery:** A short-term intervention program designed for the lowest achieving first grade students. Students receive 30 minutes, daily, of individualized instruction in reading and writing in addition to their classroom literacy program.
- **Literacy:** In-class support service with small group instruction designed to enhance classroom instruction.
- **Tier Intervention:** This process is utilized through the Personal Literacy Plan (PLP) to address weaknesses in reading. Difficulties in math are attended to through RtI interventions. Once the



desired outcome is identified, an action plan for intervention is developed, and progress is closely monitored.

- **Differentiated Instructional Strategies:** Implemented strategies are varied according to content, process, and product with special attention paid to student differences in interest, learning profile, and individual readiness.
- **Class-wide Peer Tutoring:** Students in each classroom are paired with another. Together, students nurture their understanding and mastery of a lesson. Park School teachers have found this practice benefits all students, particularly our English Language Learners (ELLs).
- **Flexible Grouping:** Park School educators utilize flexible grouping in both reading and math. Teachers constantly re-examine the strengths and weaknesses of their students when planning groups to secure success for all students.
- **Pull-Out:** Small group instruction, for entering and beginning level English Language Learners, is utilized to further improve language acquisition and vocabulary skills.

Consequently, through differentiated instruction, we are able to create a learning environment where every student feels comfortable taking risks.

## **6. Professional Development:**

Park School's faculty and staff are engaged in a wide variety of professional learning activities and curriculum initiatives. They include:

**SIOP Model:** The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model has proven effective in addressing the academic needs of English Language Learners. The SIOP Model provides a lesson plan framework resulting in well-prepared, well-delivered sheltered lessons for any subject. Teachers incorporate the students' diverse needs, cultural backgrounds, and learning styles by providing lessons that tap into the auditory, visual, and kinesthetic preferences of all students. The SIOP protocol is the instruction used to observe, rate, and provide feedback on lessons.

**Deb Armitage (District Math Coach Consultant):** Teachers received PD training to refine their approaches to teaching math problem solving. Teachers at Park have adopted the Think 5 Strategy for problem solving, and math vocabulary is taught at each grade level, along with the creation of a math word wall. This year, all students received his/her own math binder to be used as a reference book that will follow them through their years at Park. All work in the binder is student generated and coincides with the four content strands and problem solving.

**Linda Martin (District Math Coach Consultation):** For the 2010-2011, the SIT provided Park School teachers with additional PD in math problem solving, resulting from the 2009 grade 3 math NECAP findings. Classroom modeling commenced at each grade level, followed by a debriefing with the math coach.

**Dana Center:** Two teachers, along with the principal, are currently involved with the Dana Center. The goal of this year long PD is to increase student achievement in mathematics by aligning curriculum, instruction, and assessment to the common core standards. The trainees are developing and implementing support structures and tools to increase their ability to support others in the implementation of the district curriculum.

**RtI Training:** This on-going PD began with defining RtI, the Big Idea, what an intervention is, when does RtI occur in the classroom, the different tiers, and how they look at Park School. Over time RtI teams were created, as well as a RtI protocol, and action plan.

**Nancy Sinotte (District Reading/Writing Consultant):** Through the PD, strategies were modeled to teach students to construct meaning as they read, while teachers were able to create Active Literacy Classrooms that invite deep, diverse thinking and welcome questions, discussions, and debate.

## **7. School Leadership:**

Park School's leadership philosophy is obvious to all who enter the building. The faculty is comprised of a cohesive, dedicated group of individuals who embrace the collaborative culture, have a shared vision, are action and result oriented, and support change in order to enhance student achievement.

Under Marilyn Feeney's current leadership as principal of Park School, the faculty has begun to reflect on their practices, examine evidence about the relationship between practice and student outcomes, and collective inquiry. The belief is that a professional community must develop among teachers who are committed to fundamental change in teaching practices. Within a strong professional community, teachers can work collectively to set and enforce standards of instruction and learning. Within the school structure there is room for principled disagreement and discussion, thus enabling professional growth.

The SmArt School approach to creating critical friends groups was initiated by Marilyn Feeney. The very foundation for feeling safe sharing student work was established through a Compass Point activity. This activity aided team members in identifying their individual styles of working within a group and also identifying the value of all styles when working towards a common goal. Four teams were created, and these teams were designed for RtI, as well as critical friends groups, when looking at student work. Next, group norms were established to create a set of behaviors that is acceptable to everyone, helping to build trust, clarifying group expectations of one another, and establishing points of reflection.

As Park School's faculty continues to develop professional learning communities, the focus is on maintaining a supportive environment where people feel safe sharing their concerns, as well as responding to questions regarding instructional strategies. Teachers took part in a "Fish Bowl" activity designed to highlight the difference between probing and clarifying questions. The activity took place using the Collaborative Assessment Conference Protocol. Another time, the faculty were introduced to the Issaquah Protocol which is utilized when a dilemma is present.

Finally, as Park School moves forward with the implementation of critical friends groups, Marilyn Feeney, principal, will continue to provide opportunities for teachers to work collaboratively to reflect on their practice, examine evidence about the relationship between practice and student outcomes, and make changes that improve teaching and student learning in the classrooms of Park School.

## PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

### STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 3 Test: NECAP

Edition/Publication Year: 2009-2010 Publisher: Measured Progress

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	53	75	46	54	63
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	12	19	8	18	21
Number of students tested	41	32	40	39	48
Percent of total students tested	100	100	98	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	29		38	64	
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	0		0	9	
Number of students tested	14		13	11	
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					18
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					0
Number of students tested					11
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>6.</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>NOTES:</b> It should be noted that many of the grade level SES subgroups did not have what is considered to be a statistically significant number of students to support the collection and analysis of data, although we are able to provide school averages. State rules and testing vendor policies do not allow for the reporting of subgroups under 10.					

# STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 3 Test: NECAP

Edition/Publication Year: 2009-2010 Publisher: Measured Progress

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Level 3 - % Proficient plus Level 4- %Proficient w/Distinction	73	79	70	70	73
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	18	34	3	16	17
Number of students tested	40	29	39	37	48
Percent of total students tested	98	91	95	95	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Level 3 - % Proficient plus Level 4- %Proficient w/Distinction	54		58	64	
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	8		0	0	
Number of students tested	13		12	11	
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Level 3 - % Proficient plus Level 4- %Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Level 3 - % Proficient plus Level 4- %Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Level 3 - % Proficient plus Level 4- %Proficient w/Distinction					27
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					0
Number of students tested					11
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Level 3 - % Proficient plus Level 4- %Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>6.</b>					
Level 3 - % Proficient plus Level 4- %Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>NOTES:</b> It should be noted that many of the grade level SES subgroups did not have what is considered to be a statistically significant number of students to support the collection and analysis of data, although we are able to provide school averages. State rules and testing vendor policies do not allow for the reporting of subgroups under 10.					

11R12

# STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 4 Test: NECAP

Edition/Publication Year: 2009-2010 Publisher: Measured Progress

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4% Proficient w/Distinction	89	63	53	67	62
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	41	24	9	12	15
Number of students tested	27	38	34	49	34
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4% Proficient w/Distinction		58	40		
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction		17	0		
Number of students tested		12	10		
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4% Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4% Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4% Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4% Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>6.</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4% Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>NOTES:</b> It should be noted that many of the grade level SES subgroups did not have what is considered to be a statistically significant number of students to support the collection and analysis of data, although we are able to provide school averages. State rules and testing vendor policies do not allow for the reporting of subgroups under 10.					

11R12

# STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading                      Grade: 4    Test: NECAP  
Edition/Publication Year: 2009-2010 Publisher: Measured Progress

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4 - % Proficient w/Distinction	88	84	55	73	79
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	44	27	26	26	18
Number of students tested	27	37	31	47	33
Percent of total students tested	100	97	91	96	97
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4 - % Proficient w/Distinction		67			
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction		25			
Number of students tested		12			
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4 - % Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4 - % Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4 - % Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4 - % Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>6.</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4 - % Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>NOTES:</b> It should be noted that many of the grade level SES subgroups did not have what is considered to be a statistically significant number of students to support the collection and analysis of data, although we are able to provide school averages. State rules and testing vendor policies do not allow for the reporting of subgroups under 10.					

# STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 5 Test: NECAP

Edition/Publication Year: 2010-2011 Publisher: Measured Progress

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction	81	86	60	66	63
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	31	23	15	21	14
Number of students tested	36	30	47	38	35
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	97	97
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction	73				
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	36				
Number of students tested	11				
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>6.</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>NOTES:</b> It should be noted that many of the grade level SES subgroups did not have what is considered to be a statistically significant number of students to support the collection and analysis of data, although we are able to provide school averages. State rules and testing vendor policies do not allow for the reporting of subgroups under 10.					

11RI2

# STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading                      Grade: 5    Test: NECAP  
Edition/Publication Year: 2009-2010 Publisher: Measured Progress

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	88	87	68	78	68
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	21	40	11	25	21
Number of students tested	33	30	46	36	34
Percent of total students tested	92	100	98	92	94
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	82				
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	0				
Number of students tested	11				
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>6.</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>NOTES:</b> It should be noted that many of the grade level SES subgroups did not have what is considered to be a statistically significant number of students to support the collection and analysis of data, although we are able to provide school averages. State rules and testing vendor policies do not allow for the reporting of subgroups under 10.					

11RI2

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics                      Grade: 6    Test: NECAP



## Edition/Publication Year: 2009-2010 Publisher: Measured Progress

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	72	75	55	66	66
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	28	23	14	13	12
Number of students tested	32	44	37	38	26
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	97	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	70				
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	20				
Number of students tested	10				
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>6.</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>NOTES:</b> It should be noted that many of the grade level SES subgroups did not have what is considered to be a statistically significant number of students to support the collection and analysis of data, although we are able to provide school averages. State rules and testing vendor policies do not allow for the reporting of subgroups under 10.					

# STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Reading

Grade: 6 Test: NECAP

Edition/Publication Year: 2009-2010 Publisher: Measured Progress

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction	84	86	81	66	77
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	23	21	14	11	23
Number of students tested	31	43	36	38	26
Percent of total students tested	97	98	97	97	100
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>6.</b>					
Level 3-% Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>NOTES:</b> It should be noted that many of the grade level SES subgroups did not have what is considered to be a statistically significant number of students to support the collection and analysis of data, although we are able to provide school averages. State rules and testing vendor policies do not allow for the reporting of subgroups under 10.					

11RI2

# STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
Testing Month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	72	74	53	64	63
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	26	22	11	16	16
Number of students tested	136	144	158	164	143
Percent of total students tested	100	100	99	99	99
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	58	69	38	50	48
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	15	9	0	3	0
Number of students tested	40	35	37	30	23
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	50	50	40		
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	17	14	0		
Number of students tested	18	14	10		
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	28	45	13	48	31
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	0	0	0	4	4
Number of students tested	18	22	16	25	26
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	52	55	43	54	
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	14	0	0	14	
Number of students tested	21	22	23	28	
<b>6.</b>					
Level 3-%Proficient plus Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>NOTES:</b> It should be noted that many of the grade level SES groups did not have what is considered to be a statistically significant number of students to support the collection and analysis of data, therefore, we are unable to provide school averages. State rules and testing vendor policies do not allow for reporting of subgroups under 10.					

11RI2

## STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

	2009-2010	2008-2009	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006
--	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

Testing Month	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct	Oct
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
Level 3 %Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction	82	84	68	72	74
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	25	29	13	20	19
Number of students tested	131	139	152	158	141
Percent of total students tested	96	97	96	95	98
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0	0
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free/Reduced-Price Meals/Socio-economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Level 3 %Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction	71	71	55	59	65
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	8	14	0	3	4
Number of students tested	38	35	33	29	23
<b>2. African American Students</b>					
Level 3 %Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>3. Hispanic or Latino Students</b>					
Level 3 %Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction	75	58			
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	6	25			
Number of students tested	16	12			
<b>4. Special Education Students</b>					
Level 3 %Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction	56	68	25	32	38
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	6	9	0	4	4
Number of students tested	18	22	16	25	26
<b>5. English Language Learner Students</b>					
Level 3 %Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction	63	59	29	43	
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction	0	0	0	5	
Number of students tested	16	17	17	21	
<b>6.</b>					
Level 3 %Proficient plus Level 4-% Proficient w/Distinction					
Level 4-%Proficient w/Distinction					
Number of students tested					
<b>NOTES:</b> It should be noted that many of the grade level SES subgroups did not have what is considered to be a statistically significant number of students to support the collection and analysis of data, although we are able to provide school averages. State rules and testing vendor policies do not allow for the reporting of subgroups under 10.					

11RI2